

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Reconsideration of the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Examiner objects to the brief description of the drawings on page 4 as there is no description of Figures 1a and 1b of the drawings. The description has been amended in order to recite Figures 1a and 1b. The Examiner states that on page 6, line 6, Applicant cites "...optical module 30 is provided in Figure 11." The Examiner notes that there is no Figure 11. The specification has been corrected in order to recite Figure 2, which shows the optical module 30. The Examiner states that on page 6, line 8, Applicant cites "(OUT) 324." The Examiner questions whether this should be "(OTU) 324." The Examiner is correct and the specification has been so amended. The Examiner rejects Claims 1-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The Examiner states that in Claim 1, line 5, the "processor circuitry coupled to the plurality of optical receivers" and on line 7 the "an interface unit" are not disclosed in the specification nor shown in the figures.

Accordingly, the term "interface unit" has been deleted from Claim 1. With respect to the processor circuit being coupled to a plurality of optical receivers, Figure 2 has been amended in order to show this feature. In addition to the recitation of the feature in the claims, Applicants believe that there is sufficient description in the specification at page 10, lines 4-10, page 15, lines 13-17. The coupling of processors to multiple devices is well known in the art, accordingly, Applicants believe that there is sufficient description in the specification to support the correction of Figure 2 to show the links to a second optical transceiver. This also corrects the problem the Examiner had with Claim 15, line 5.

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-6, 8-14, 20, 21, 23 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Doucet et al. The Examiner specifically refers to Figures 3 and 4 of Doucet.

We cannot agree. Figure 3 of Doucet et al does not show an embodiment in which received optical wireless signal are converted to electrical signals, as in the present invention. In Figure 3, the optical router 110 routes the optical signals from one path to another path. Figure 4 of Doucet et al shows a system which is similar to the present invention. Please see column 7, lines 23-44. However, as clearly shown in Figure 4, the transceiver units 800 have a plurality of paths they can receive data on. The paths of various adjacent receivers do overlap, as can be seen by the inspection of Figure 4.


see col. 17  
lines 5-9

In sharp contrast, the present invention has the receivers receiving a signal having a common property, such as the frequency on which the light is transmitted, separated by an amount that prohibits two receivers having overlapping fields from being designed to receive a signal having the same common property. This feature is not shown or suggested by Doucet et al, the Examiner's statements to the contrary notwithstanding.

The Examiner rejects Claims 15, 17-19 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doucet et al. The same arguments provided above concerning the anticipation of the invention by Doucet et al apply here as well.

Accordingly, Applicants believe that the Application, as amended, is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,  
Texas Instruments Incorporated

By   
William B. Kempler  
Senior Corporate Patent Counsel  
Reg. No. 28,228  
Tel.: (972) 917-5452

